DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 157 HE 015 601

AUTHOR Kimble, Gregory A.
TITLE Background Materials for Chairman's Workshop.
PUB DATE 30 Aug 78
NOTE 77p.; Materials prepared for workshop given by the National Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology, American Psychological Association (Toronto, Ontario, August 30, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Budgeting; College Faculty; *Department Heads; Departments; Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Workload; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Productivity; *Psychology; Records (Forms); Scholarship; School Organization; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Promotion; Teaching Assistants

ABSTRACT

Information for newly appointed heads of graduate departments of psychology is presented as background material for the 1978 chairmen's workshop. Topics include the following: the budgetary situation, faculty productivity, faculty workload, teacher recruitment, faculty morale, graduate student morale, teaching load of teaching assistants, the intellectual and attitudinal situations, the structure of universities, the role of the department head, methods of strengthening the department, the departmental budget, and personal style. It is suggested that the academic world is currently dominated by three powerful forces: insufficient funds to accommodate current levels of activity, much less support expansion; a rapidly changing intellectual situation that brings special pressures for academic administration; and an attitudinal situation that adds to the department head's problems. The almost universal reaction to this difficult academic situation has been for university administrators to pay more attention to faculty productivity and workload. Issues of tenure, replacement of faculty who leave, and the consequences of unionization are also addressed. One trend in graduate study is a move from high specialization to more general training. Three levels of administration are considered: the upper or central administration, colleges and schools, and the department. The department head position is examined in relation to three roles: leader, manager, and passive caretaker. Functions of recruiting and appointing new faculty, faculty development, and faculty evaluation are addressed, including salary recommendations, promotion, tenure, and dismissal. A form for reporting scholarly and professional activities is appended. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED222157

# NATIONAL COUNCIL OF GRADUATE DEPARTMENTS OF PSYCHOLOGY

Background Materials
for
CHAIRMAN'S WORKSHOP

Toronto, Wednesday, August 30, 1978

Commonwealth Centre Room
Holiday Inn Toronto

Business meeting of
Council 9:00 a.m. -12:00 noon

Workshop 1:00 p.m. -3:00 p.m.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gregory A. Kimble

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Gregory A. Kimble
Duke University

HE 015 611

# PREFACE

After a four-year lapse, while I was not a member of the National Council, here is the sixth edition of Background Materials for the Chairman's Workshop. The content is about 35 percent new. I developed these materials by writing to two groups of people, inviting them to comment on their experience as chairmen. The first group, as previously, was all members of the National Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology. This year, however, I left the form of the response much more open than I have in the past. As a result I received several dozen long letters, commenting on a considerable range of topics. The second group was 30-40 ex-chairmen to whom I wrote, thinking that their retrospective observations might be useful. They were. Excerpts from the letters I received from these chairmen and ex-chairmen are prominent among the "fillers" that I have sprinkled generously among the pages of this booklet--anonymously, as many of you requested.

I wish to thank the members of the Council for their input. I also wish to thank the secretarial staff at Duke University who did the tedious work on this project: Edna Bissette, Hazel Carpenter, Darlene Harvey, Dorothy Mitchell, Amby Peach, and Mara Spillman.

Gregory A. Kimble
Durham, N.C.
July 15, 1978

# OVERVIEW: A LETTER TO A NEW CHAIRMAN

Greetings:

So they finally persuaded you. Congratulations and commiserations! The decision you have just made is one that will sometimes mean great satisfaction to you; it is also a decision that you will sometimes bitterly regret.

Are you sure the decision makes sense? You are at the peak of your career in research and your new responsibilities will seriously cut into your time for that. You enjoy teaching but you will be doing less of it now and in what you do you are apt to be less effective than you once were. Unless you are very unusual your new job will so occupy your time that you will get out of touch with your field and the strains of the position are apt to show up in your lectures. You have almost no administrative experience and bookkeeping is a mystery to you. You are a peaceful person, almost afraid to deal with conflict. But now you will have to cope with it on a daily basis. Whatever made you do it?

Actually I do not expect an answer to the question of why you took the job. In six or seven hundred replies in the materials I have received over the past few years in preparing for the Chairman's Workshop, I have obtained very few insights into the motives that lead one to take the fatal step. Those who made relevant comments at all seemed to regard their accepting the position as the product of a moment of madness. And a few of them resigned within a year or so to regain their sanity. I suppose that one reason for taking the job is just to find out whether you can do it. Unfortunately, there is no real way for you to find out without giving it a try. If you find out that

you cannot, at least you will be able to retire from the position shortly, relieved of whatever the urges were that got you into it.

So far this has been too vague to be helpful. Thus, I will take advantage of the lofty perch to which I have ascended with my years of experience and pronounce for you the essential lessons I have learned. (What follows is partly adapted from an anonymous "Exchange of Letters," that appeared in The Physiologist, 1968, 11, 58-62. Some of it is from letters from other colleagues.)

Lesson 1. As the head of a department you must be prepared to budget between one-fourth and one-half of your time for the totally unexpected. You must be able to respond cheerfully and without annoyance to calls for a variety of services and to switch back and forth from the unexpected to the routine without clashing mental or emotional gears.

Yesterday was typical. In the course of the day, I (a) received a call from an irate parent about what he took to be inappropriate content in a course taken by his daughter, (b) talked to a secretary who was dissatisfied with her salary increase, (c) listened for the umpteenth time to a story of personal friction in the departmental shop, (d) had coffee with a former student who was passing through town and stopped in to see me, (e) after receiving a slightly paranoid phone call, tried to find out what had happened to a questionnaire that never was returned to a local minority student organization.

What is most frustrating is that such interruptions have a nasty way of happening just when you think you have caught up with the job and have

settled down to read an article or to work on a manuscript.

Lesson 2. In your new position you will find that you have so much hidden power that you do not need the overt power expressed in bossing people. This comes about in two ways: First you are the channel through which information flows to the top. Second you are the only one who thinks five minutes ahead for the department. You will have to worry about a great many problems, and the fact that you have thought ahead and have solutions at least tentatively formed will go a long way toward making your decisions the ones that are accepted.

Lesson 3. Your power outside the department is greater than you probably think. If the University administration asks you to take courses of action that you think are ill-advised (e.g. giving up some of your space to another department) you can often say no and make it stick. If you discover that you lack this power, I think that you also will have discovered something either about yourself or your situation to indicate that you and the chairmanship do not go well together.

Lesson 4. In important matters never do today what can be put off until tomorrow. By tomorrow you will have had time to think things over. Moreover some of your problems will not really be yours and by tomorrow someone else will have handled them. Beyond that some problems are not problems at all and tomorrow it will be clear that whatever it was was not worth doing. Some problems really will go away if you ignore them.

Lesson 5. In your dealings with everyone, guard your reputation for candor jealously, so that what you say counts when you want it to. For

example, do not pretend in the presence of the Dean that your most worthless faculty member is actually making a superb contribution. Save such recommendations for the person who really is doing an outstanding job.

With your colleagues do not hold back information unless you must. Except for the details of salaries and other matters related to personnel there is very little information that needs to be kept back from anyone. An open office door is widely appreciated.

Lesson 6. Do your homework thoroughly. In the academic world discussions of programs and proposals are usually marked more by opinion than evidence. Be an exception to that rule. Know where your departmental budget is going. Know what you need to improve your programs. Have course enrollments at your finger tips. If you have facts and no one else does, you will often get your way when others cannot. Quick wits, a good memory, ability to think on your feet, frankness and modesty, plus a great deal of hard work will see you through.

Lesson 7. Be prepared on important issues to propose alternatives. If you don't get your preferred solution to a problem, other solutions may be possible. Total inflexibility can get you nowhere.

Lesson 8. No one should expect a department to be one big happy family. No matter what the quality of the faculty, it will certainly be full of conflicts. However, if the leading people in the department are mature people they will submerge their differences for the good of the common enterprise. There is no rule that says that you have to like a person to maintain a sound working relationship.

Lesson 9. Make decision processes as explicit and as public as you can. It is trust in the fairness of the process, not necessarily universal acceptance of the decision, that makes the system work. Especially in dealing with conflict it is important to have machinery available to help you avoid giving an impression of whimsical, personal decisions. You will need documents that define the rule of law for your department. If they do not exist, make their preparation a first item of business.

Lesson 10. Be clear on your goals for the department. A degree of specialization develops which is inevitable. Since you cannot represent every nook and cranny of knowledge in your programs, be sure that new programs, faculty appointments, and curricular changes make sense in terms of long term objectives. Do not let immediate convenience or pressures from highly regarded faculty push you into moves that are ill considered.

Lesson 11. Delegate as much as you can. Exactly what you delegate and what you do not delegate may be your biggest problems. Give it some serious thought. But you must delegate some things. The usual mechanism for delegation involves the development of a committee structure in the department. Whatever your decision in this regard, be careful to give your associates the authority that goes with the delegated responsibility. Otherwise you will find yourself doing the job yourself.

Lesson 12. Where you cannot delegate, seek advice. Your colleagues on the faculty can be helpful. But more than that, they have an insatiable need to be consulted. And all of them have it. Try to spread such requests around so that everyone is consulted from time to time.

Lesson 13. Take stock of your personal resources and values and decide where you want to devote your energies. You have the responsibility of making up your mind what you want to do with your life. You cannot be a full-time administrator, a full-time researcher and a full-time teacher, all at the same time. Give up something.

But giving up something will mean giving up activities in which you now take great pride. Ask yourself this: will you find adequate substitute satisfaction in the accomplishments of your colleagues? If the honest answer is no, your term in office is apt to be brief.

Lesson 14. Prepare for your own demise as chairman. If you do more than a custodial job in your position you will inevitably make mistakes, hurt people's feelings, discriminate against the incompetent and offend the upper administration in your insistence that they support departmental goals. The aftermath of all of this accumulates and will tend to make your job more and more difficult. I think of myself as having a certain number of chips that I must spend with the administration and with my faculty to pay for the lines of action they dislike. Eventually that supply will run out. The only question is the question of time. Before the inevitable happens, make plans for an orderly transition of leadership.

I doubt that I have been of much help to you with all this pontification but I have done my best. The last lesson I could give you is in a way the most important but probably the most useless of all because there is not much you can do about the problem. Be prepared for the emotional toll your new position will take. Anxiety about the job is normal and sleepless

nights will probably happen now and then. I suppose that my advice would have to be to live with it for a while. If you find you have developed a low threshold for a reaction of righteous indignation you will probably make it. If your low threshold turns out to be for feelings of guilt, or if you find yourself making an adjustment in the form of the vacuum activity called paper work, QUIT.

Yours,

Gregory A. Kimble

P.S. I hope this afterthought is not too late: I do not know what your present salary is, of course, but assuming that it is average for your rank, you should be getting about a 15 percent raise for next year and a guaranteed summer salary. In addition it is quite common for the chairman to be given a leave with pay after about a three-year term in office.

Jones' Law
The man who can smile when
things go wrong has thought of
someone he can blame it on.

# THE CURRENT ACADEMIC SCENE

The academic world these days is dominated by three powerful forces, insufficient funds to accommodate current levels of activity, much less support expansion, a rapidly changing intellectual situation that brings very special pressures to bear on academic administration, and an attitudinal situation that adds to the chairman's problems.

## The Budgetary Situation

All universities have come to depend to an important extent upon federal funds for the support of their programs. In some universities such monies may constitute as much as 40 to 50 percent of the budget. Now the nearly total disappearance of these funds has become a grim possibility, and severe cutbacks have occurred across the board. Prospects for recovering our losses of outside support are gloomy.

Legislators who provide the funds for state universities have shown little enthusiasm for providing increased budgets. They have responded to our problems with an attitude that falls somewhere on the dimension from apathy to antipathy. Status quo budgets and even reductions have been the result. The problems of the private universities are at least as difficult. Endowment income will not stretch to cover operating expenses. Alumni have cut back on contributions. Tuition increases do not keep pace with increased costs of education. The general picture is one in which support for university activities lags more and more behind inflation.

To make things worse student enrollment is dropping in many universities. What makes this serious, particularly in public institutions, is that budgets are usually tied to enrollments in some way. If enrollments decrease, formulae exist that demand reductions in number of faculty. This, together with decreased financial support, has led to a situation in many places where faculty, including tenured faculty, are being dismissed, and hiring new faculty is impossible. In the most extreme case I have heard of, the faculty of one good state university has been reduced by about 15% by legislative fiat. In the face of such huge reductions, even the best departments are bound to lose personnel. In fact, a peculiar line of administrative logic has sometimes made the best departments the ones that have to suffer the most: since they <u>are</u> the best they can absorb the losses without being destroyed.

Against this background of shrinking enrollment and shrinking support, changes internal to the universities are adding to the problem. Courses of study that were enormously popular a few years ago are losing their appeal. In psychology, for example, a fairly common pattern in the early 1970's was for undergraduate enrollment to triple in a three or four-year period. In the most recent three or four year period, by contrast, enrollments have at best increased very modestly. More often they have decreased. In some cases the decrease in undergraduate enrollment has been as much as 30-40 percent.

At the graduate level the picture is more complicated. The very best universities have but back on the sizes of their graduate programs in the

training areas where jobs are hardest to find. Sometimes these departments have allowed the less troubled areas to take up the slack. The weakest programs seem to have gone blithely ahead, allowing their graduate programs in all areas to grow larger. I believe that this inflation in the sizes of programs probably does everyone harm. There is some evidence that, except in the applied areas, the quality of applicants is lower than it was a few years ago. Training such individuals hardly seems a benefit to the field. What it does do is increase the number of poorly qualified applicants for jobs and also the number of such individuals who will not find the job for which they believed they were preparing themselves.

Student Credit Hour Accountability

The almost universal reaction to this difficult academic situation has been for university administrators to pay more and more attention to faculty productivity. Although this concept covers research and service as well as teaching, the focus of attention is usually on undergraduate course enrollments. The focus is natural because the administrator looking into things is apt to be the Dean responsible for the programs in Arts and Science. In any event, just a little investigation quickly brings to light the fact that there are faculty who do very little for their salaries. They teach a couple of courses, sometimes only one, with very few students, and do little or nothing more. Any objective observer must admit that this is a problem.

The problem results in part from the fact that the past decades have seen a not very subtle shift in the definition of standard faculty workloads. At one time the typical teaching load was 9 or 12 hours for everyone. Later

on this load was reduced specifically for administrative responsibilities and research. In this way the relatively standard load became 6 hours. When we hired new people most of us emphasized the importance of research and when they were hired younger people were granted the reduction in teaching hours to allow for research. A few generations of this practice is what led to the redefinition. Now, the standard load is 6 hours with research being something that the faculty member does if he has time and feels like it. Some do not and the obvious question is whether these people should not be spending more time in the classroom. My own opinion is that they should be. If it is not too late in your department, it might be wise to have a formal statement to the effect that the standard teaching load is 9 or 12 hours and that a lighter load must be justified in terms of research and/or administrative or service responsibilities.

A related fact that needs to be considered is that the inevitable result of a cutback in the size of our graduate programs will be that there will be students for fewer graduate courses. In many departments, enrollments in these courses have already fallen below the official levels required for them to be given. Explanations and excuses will stave off the inevitable consequences for a while. We should take this time to adjust to the new situation. The courses of action that occur to me are the following:

1. There is nothing sacred about the 50-50 split between graduate and undergraduate teaching that most of us have become accustomed to. A shift to a division with more emphasis on undergraduate teaching will probably decrease the size of undergraduate courses in departments where

enrollment is holding up. This would provide a number of faculty with respectable teaching contributions which they otherwise might not make. No doubt the details of such adjustments will vary in different universities. My own preference would be to shift more of the undergraduate instruction to the most senior faculty, letting junior faculty emphasize graduate education because of its positive influence on their research.

2. Minor tinkering with the curriculum can have beneficial consequences. If appropriate undergraduates can be enrolled in your graduate courses, these courses will be large enough to continue to give them. The experience of most of us has been that our best undergraduate students are superior to our average graduate students. Such an arrangement will improve the quality of the courses.

3. Something else that isn't sacred is the sequence in which courses are given. Some departments have developed graduate programs where graduate-level courses offered in the first two years are alternated so that first- and second-year graduate students take them together. This effectively doubles the enrollment in such courses, a fact that allows them to continue to exist.

4. This will shock the expansionist mentality but I am in favor of reducing the sizes of departments. I believe, if you think twice about it, that you will discover that you profitably could allow the "passengers" on your staff to disembark, making an agreement with your administration not to fill the vacancies thus created, in exchange for better support of other sorts--secretarial, supplies, equipment, whatever you most need and is

possible in your university.

5. Realize that the orientation of undergraduate students has changed in the last few years. Social action is out; preparation for a career is in. If your enrollments have been falling off, you can probably attract students back to the department by catering to this new professionalism. This means, only in part, offering courses that apply the basic subject matter of your discipline. Courses that prepare students for graduate work in the various professional schools will qualify.

6. Require the faculty who do little else to do more teaching than their more productive colleagues. There are, of course, individuals for whom this solution is unattractive because their teaching is no better than their research. Such people will present some of your toughest problems, particularly when they are tenured. No viable solutions appear to exist.

A somewhat parenthetic point that seems appropriate here concerns a possible two-track road to tenure that some departments have considered. The high road would be the normal one, involving teaching and research. The low road would be through teaching. The individual on this track would teach more than his colleague on the traditional track. Although this solution has a certain human appeal it has been rejected by every department that has reported considering it, for the following reasons: (1) It would create a condition of second-class departmental citizenship for those on the teaching track. (2) Research is of the essence in the traditional conception of a university. A faculty member who does not do research should find a position in a teaching institution. (3) Given the job

market, it is possible to find people who are good teachers and good researchers. To maintain quality, these are the people we should be hiring.

7. Encourage faculty in a position to do so to buy released time for research on research grants. In universities where the teaching load is nine hours or more, such practices seem justified as a way of encouraging scholarly productivity. Where the standard load is 6 hours, however, watch out for this type of development. Professor X buys half of his time on a research grant, reducing his load to three hours per semester. For these three hours he proposes to offer a graduate course one term and his seminar the next, thus effectively removing himself first from any participation in undergraduate education and then from departmental activities in general. If you are overstaffed, this outcome is fine, at least temporarily. But, if you are not, you should probably have these agreements available for the good of the department: (a) a commitment from Professor X to give at least one undergraduate course a year, (b) a further agreement that the seminar will not be just a lab meeting for Professor X's students, (c) an agreement from the dean to provide the department with Professor X's salary so that you can appoint temporary faculty.

Effects upon Recruiting

Administrations have clarified an important point in recent years and have arrived at the conclusion that faculty slots do not belong to departments. When a resignation or retirement occurs, the position thus vacated becomes a University position to be filled where the need is greatest. There is also an important parallel distinction that you should understand. Whereas we

think of appointments in terms of "slots," university administrators think in terms of dollars. They have to, because that is the way their budgets come, except in a few cases where a state legislature has line-by-line (that is, position-by-position) power over the budget. This means then that the replacement of a $26,000 full professor with a $13,000 assistant professor will release funds to pay the entire salary of a second assistant professor. As a result of such considerations, most recruiting these days is for people at a junior level. Similar considerations apply with respect to secretaries, shop personnel, research technicians, animal caretakers and janitors.

In this connection, there is a point about minority-group faculty to keep in mind. They receive higher salaries than other faculty and, seen in terms of dollars, hiring a minority faculty member could conceivably affect the income of every other member of the department. You should argue for special appropriations, that sometimes can be obtained through minority-group programs, to pay the difference between a minority-group salary and a usual one.

Recruiting's hidden agenda. Since many of us can make a case for needed faculty, there is a fair chance of being allowed to hire new faculty this year. If you do, there is also a fair chance that you will regret it later. The problem is that, if they are good, the additional faculty require secretarial help, supplies, research space, and office space, all of which may be harder to acquire than the new faculty member was in the first place. Sad experience has now shown several departments that hiring an animal caretaker, another secretary, additional shop personnel, a library assistant or getting

Murphy's First Law
If anything can go wrong, it will.

Mrs. Murphy's Comment
Murphy was an optimist.

Murphy's Fourth Law
If there is a possibility of several things going wrong, the one that will cause the most damage will be the one to go wrong.

The How Come It All Landed on Me Law
Whatever hits the fan will not be evenly distributed.

> It is incredible that there are so many unattractive candidates. It is our experience that about half of those who look good on paper bomb out once they hit the scene. They are very thin and narrow in their perspectives and competencies and have few skills which would allow them to relate effectively to graduate students and faculty.

We have had serious problems with area structure in the department, especially because we are both very large and very diverse. Our judgment about this serious problem was reinforced by a Graduate Program Review of three distinguished professionals from around the country, who recommended (not very plausibly) that we abolish our area structure altogether. The principal stress for the department that is attributable to the area structure is the competition it fosters between areas for new recruitment positions. A secondary issue is that it discourages communication, collaboration and heterogeneous training of graduate students.

Franklin's Rule
Blessed is he who expects nothing
for he shall not be disappointed.

a better bookkeeper might well have done the department more good than adding a faculty member.

If you decide that adding faculty is necessary and/or desirable, the problem of support is something you should consider at the time of recruiting. In discussions with prospective faculty, I make it a point to get a realistic statement of needs for equipment and supplies and include a provision for them in my offering letter. If the dean is willing to put an OK on the letter, this commits the support. If such commitments are impossible, you may be better off without the new faculty member.

Problems in recruiting. The circumstances surrounding recruitment have been chaotic in the past few years and there is little prospect of a change for the better. The reason for this is fiscal uncertainty. University budgets are sometimes not firm until mid-summer. As a result, several of my respondents have described similar sequences of events. First they thought they had a job to fill. Then it disappeared because of some other demand on the university budget. Then the position materialized again, but now it was too late to do a responsible job of recruiting. In particular, they found it impossible to meet open advertising procedures required in affirmative action programs. A couple of people had useful advice to offer at this point. One was to do preliminary advertising for jobs and screening of candidates on the basis of just a possibility, so that if a position becomes available, you are able to fill it. Otherwise, you may lose the chance to add faculty to some more enterprising individual. "In my experience, if you are not ready with a live candidate, you cannot compete."

The second bit of advice was to offer an initial one-year appointment if you recruit too hastily. This will identify the position as a reality where it counts most--in the university budget. At the same time, it prevents your making a long-term mistake. Unfortunately, the tight job market in most disciplines has produced a new problem in the area of recruiting. I have received many complaints about the enormous gap between the actual quality of many applicants and the strength of their recommendations. ("We had 650 applicants for a job and most of them could walk on water.") If a department is misled into making a mistake for this or any other reason, a short-term appointment can be terminated much less painfully than a longer-term appointment that has given the individual time to make friends in the department and to begin to sink roots.

Affirmative action and equal opportunity regulations enter the picture at this point. These programs require open advertising for faculty positions. This is a rule to go along with, partly on the statistical ground that anything that limits the range of candidates for a job will reduce the average quality of your pool of applicants. Most of us also want to go along with the rule for moral reasons. Whatever your ethical position, however, you can meet the requirements of equal opportunity by making the hastily recruited appointment an <u>acting</u> one rather than a regular appointment. Such an appointment will also be easier to terminate than a regular appointment if you end up having to do that.

Incidentally, in connection with recruiting be sure that you bring your negotiations with every candidate to some final and formal conclusion. Do

not leave a new Ph. D. sitting somewhere waiting to hear from you. This has been made more difficult to accomplish in recent years with the institution of policies of open advertising of jobs. A thousand applications for a single position is not uncommon. The resulting paper work and costs have become an impossible burden in many departments. Even those who have tried to cope have slipped up too often add have received many angry letters from applicants wanting to know, "Whatever happened to the job you were considering me for?" About the only useful thought I have on this problem is that careful job descriptions in your advertising may reduce the flood of applications. My only evidence for this is that a couple of years ago at Colorado, we received only about 150 applications per position for those we advertised, stating required qualifications quite specifically.

Incidentally and just for information, such evidence as exists suggests that only about 10 percent of the positions being filled (in psychology at least) can clearly be identified as the result of open advertising. The majority of appointments are still made to people turned up through personal contacts.

Faculty Morale

As far back as memory serves, friction and conflict have been features of the departmental condition nearly everywhere. In our current pressure-laden times, these tensions have increased to the point where almost any issue can polarize a faculty and divide it into factions. Money appears to be (as usual) the root of this particular evil. The more immediate cause, however, is a tenure situation that is vastly different now from what it was when the people currently coming up for tenure were hired.

More than a few faculties are now 100 percent tenured. Too many members of these departments are quietly resting on their laurels. Possibly out of an awareness of this common outcome, the tenure system has been abolished in a few institutions. Elsewhere the use of non-tenure-track appointments is frequent. More and more of our best universities are moving to 8-10 year "probationary" periods. New faculty with 3-4 years of experience are being hired under an arrangement that requires them to "start over" on the tenure track. Most commonly of all, the criteria for tenure have been raised by Deans' committees to the point where few people are granted tenure.

In this atmosphere, tenure decisions are becoming fraught with greater and greater conflict. The "hard scientists" refuse to support the recommendations of the "humanists." Younger faculty are lined up against the older faculty. Such conflicts give rise to badly split votes on tenure. Usually this is all it takes to guarantee the denial of tenure at the Dean's level.

The first result of this state of affairs is a pervasive feeling of insecurity among the younger faculty. Add to this the fact that salary increases have been small in the past few years, and senior faculty join the ranks of the insecure. This sets the stage for two types of reaction, neither of which is very healthy. These two malignant reactions are unionism and alienation.

The consequences of unionization seem uniformly to be bad in every sphere except (almost always) the monetary one. The most serious effect has been that union policy prevents the use of merit as a basis for differential

Throughout the University, there is a strong reciprocal paranoia between faculty and administration. Due to their dissatisfaction with the administration, the faculty, in their infinite wisdom, voted in the A.F.T. two years ago. Now there are no degrees of freedom left. Leadership is impossible since the chairman is not in the bargaining unit and is, therefore, the enemy.

Fandel's Rules for Administrators

1. Hide!
2. If they find you, lie.

> The tenure process will be a sham in the future: a person will be terminated in the fifth year rather than go through the union hassle of reviewing and rejecting. Anyone we keep for the fifth year will be tenured.

The major problem I have encountered is that both students and faculty have adopted the threat and/or practice of litigation as a means of coping with their own inadequacies. One student finally went so far as to tell our Chancellor that she knew she had flunked a course but that she wanted her grade removed from her transcript or she would cause him severe difficulty with the media. Since the university was already experiencing problems with the press anyhow, he removed the grade!

salary recommendations, a policy that seems guaranteed to create mediocrity.

The reaction of alienation is at least as bad. Faculty members who see their standards of living gradually eroding look to other sources of income. These sources are most readily available to the stronger senior (tenured) faculty. Such people turn to consulting, textbook writing and gradually lose their attachment to the university. While this goes on the weaker faculty are developing their own types of alienation. They are busily goofing off.

Graduate Student Morale

The insecurities of the junior faculty are also a concern of the current group of graduate students. In fact, their situation may be even more difficult because they appear increasingly to doubt the sense of what they are doing, as well as to have a realistic worry about getting a decent job if they persist in their graduate program. Maybe the source of the general concern is the specific one: "How can what we are doing be of value when there is so little demand for us?" However that may be, there are many reports of alienated graduate students who reject academic as well as cultural values, of "clinical students whose appearance and demeanor would surely terrify a client," and of other students who are ready to chuck it all and enter some other line of work. Many of this group do in fact drop out, moving on to computer work, business, or a different professional school.

One very common result of this general dissatisfaction has been a demand on the part of graduate students for greater participation in

departmental affairs, a demand to which departments have usually acceded. Initial reports, without exception, pointed to the success of this administrative innovation. Recently, however, a new and disturbing note has appeared in responses to my questionnaire. Serving on reappointment committees, graduate students in some cases have not had the courage to make a negative recommendation, knowing that this could leave a faculty member without a job. Usually they have had the responsibility of making a recommendation in the area of teaching and research supervision. In two cases reported to me, very junior faculty members have been reappointed largely on the basis of such a recommendation, but later on it was discovered that the people were actually quite ineffective. It seems clear that no important judgment of this type should be left solely to the student members of a committee.

Teaching assistant's teaching loads. A new threat to the graduate student's frame of mind looms large on the horizon in the form of plans to increase their teaching responsibilities if they hold teaching assistantships. In the past most of us have considered the teaching assistantship a partial subsidy of the students and have tried to lighten the work loads of graduate students so that they would have more time for study and research. In terms of long-term social objectives, I think that this attitude is easy to justify. Not so in the jungle occupied by the tigers in charge of budget, however. They view the teaching assistant as a sort of educational janitor polishing up so many undergraduate minds for so many hours a week for such and such a wage. In that attitudinal context an argument can be made that the teaching assistant should polish longer and harder.

Be prepared for requests to account for how your teaching assistants spend their time and prepare a description of what the average teaching assistant does. The assistant's duties probably include (1) attendance at you faculty's classes, (2) attendance at the teaching assistant's own formal sessions, (3) preparation for these sessions, (4) paper grading, and (5) individual conferences with students. In most large universities this will prove that teaching assistants do, in fact, spend nearly the 20 hours a week commonly required. Be forewarned and prepare such an accounting before you receive an unexpected demand for it and have to come up with answers on the spur of the moment.

That's half of the story. The other half is that you may have to help protect the teaching assitants from you. With graduate enrollments declining, many universities are finding that they lack the TAs to cover their courses. Some of my earlier recommendations to increase the amount of undergraduate teaching your department does will increase the need for teaching assistants. The most obvious solution appears to be to let undergraduate students take on some of the teaching assistants duties.

## The Intellectual Situation

The recent years have been years of self study. Departments have begun to ask basic questions about their goals and their means of achieving those goals. Although it is too soon to discern details, the general directions of change are becoming visible. One trend that appears to be gaining strength is a move from high specialization in graduate training, back to more general training. Although a few departments are strengthening their

compartmentalized area structures, many more of them are weakening these structures. Core requirements appear to be on their way back in, and some interdisciplinary programs are developing.

Another developing trend is toward application. Some of the new fields in psychology are environmental psychology, program evaluation, forensic psychology, and behavioral medicine. Without objective data, I suspect that more traditional programs can develop an applied option by developing practicum arrangements that would give students experience in local business, industry, hospitals, and educational institutions. Perhaps we should be looking into the possibility of developing "practica" and "internships" for all of our students to prepare them for non-academic jobs.

## The Attitudinal Situation

The unrest and turmoil of the late '60's and early '70s were emotional reactions against social injustice. They led to regulations and procedures that have changed the chairman's life in ways that are sometimes quite unattractive. Affirmative action, equal opportunity, and due process are phrases that identify the areas of change. What makes the situation unattractive is that, while most of us accept the underlying values expressed in these phrases: (1) their implementation has been put in the hands of a mindless bureaucracy that is largely ignorant of academic values; (2) too often these values have been manipulated and made to serve very different purposes.

### Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity

The commitment of most universities to recruit women and members of

the ethnic minorities as graduate students and faculty has led to several problems.

1. In the case of faculty, the best candidates available, judged by objective criteria, are frequently women. Most of us have been successful in recruiting them, using the same standards as we have in the past. Finding qualified minority group people is very difficult. Most of us have been frustrated in our efforts to recruit such individuals.

2. Except in the case of women, qualified minority group graduate students are also hard to find and poorly qualified ones have been admitted. The pattern of minority group programs is similar in many universities. It involves (a) relaxing admission standards for Black and Mexican-American students. Specifically this tends to mean disregarding the GRE in admissions, (b) a commitment to proportional representation (e.g. 20 percent) of minority group graduate students and (c) a commitment to the student of two years (rather than one) of financial backing during which the hope is that deficiencies in the student's preparation can be corrected. It is still too early to evaluate these programs.

3. A third set of problems arises from the characteristic operating style of radical groups. Experience suggests that you exercise unusual care in dealings with minority groups. Small issues have been magnified and major ones have been distorted.

4. The amount of paper work that has to be done in minority program accounting is enormous. You will be asked to identify minority faculty, indicate how much they are paid, describe programs of affirmative action,

defend the hiring of a non-minority faculty member, account for differentials in pay, if they appear to exist, and so on. There is no way to avoid these chores. One thing you can avoid, however, is weakening your faculty through reverse discrimination. Although you may have to counter some pretty exotic arguments, it is usually possible to stick to the criteria of academic excellence.

The New Formalism

The reason that most of us favor programs of equal opportunity is that we believe that such decisions as those involving salary, promotion and tenure should be made on the basis of scholarly, academic accomplishments and nothing else. Even to put the point, however, is to recognize the possibility that other factors might contribute to, or even dictate, these decisions. Now that it is illegal for race and sex to determine the treatment of faculty, these considerations have been used in ways that what started out as disagreements over personnel actions have ended up as law suits. Among those who have brought charges are students who have been excluded from graduate programs, students who have been dropped from programs, faculty members whose salaries are low and faculty members who have failed to gain reappointment or tenure. The experience of living through one of these disputes can be extremely unpleasant according to those who have had it.

One other consequence of the social conditions that produce such problems has been the emergence of a more legalistic approach to issues than was once the case in academic life. We now have formal constitutions, associated operating guidelines, formally stipulated lines of communication,

definitions of who is a faculty member and who is not and on and on.

Many of us find such formality distasteful and yearn for a return to simpler times. I doubt that it will happen, however, and suggest several lines of action for the chairman: (1) Be sure that you know how grievances are handled in your university in detail so that you will understand what is going on if you are called upon to defend your actions. (2) Develop whatever documents you need to allow your department to function. (3) Be sure that you follow affirmative action guidelines in hiring and firing. Jobs may have to be listed for stipulated periods of time. Faculty recruiting committees may have to include both women and members of ethnic minorities. You may have to consider some minimum number of applicants for a position. You may or may not be required to give reasons when you dismiss a faculty member. Sure as death and taxes you are going to have to keep records of your recruiting activities. (4) Be very careful about what you put in writing on faculty matters. You may have to defend it in court. (5) In the case of my most difficult people, I have developed the practice of keeping a separate private file which includes not only correspondence on controversial matters but my own evaluations of these situations as they arise. When old sores are reopened, as they will be, this is enough to refresh my memory as to what actually happened. (6) If disgruntled faculty make outrageous and distorted statements about your function and if these statements reach the press do not respond through the media: (a) by the time they reach the daily paper, the distortions are themselves distorted and you may find yourself in the untenable position of reacting to charges that were not

made. (b) What you should do is to discuss the problem personally with the individual involved. (c) If you must react in writing, prepare a dated memorandum identified as "for the file, for use when and if needed" and include it in the private file mentioned above. (d) Another form of response that is sometimes therapeutic is to prepare as vicious a reaction as you can and then throw it away.

The size of central administrations is growing and the decision-making structure is getting more absurd. We used to get decisions from senior deans promptly and in English. This is less the case now. Meanwhile, because of national reporting requirements, and because of Parkinson's Law operating on central administrations, we are asked to fill more and more reports, the purposes of which are obscure to us. Because of this there is an inevitable pressure for the chairman to become nothing but that--a full-time chairman. My predecessors had been able to be chairmen, carry a full-time teaching load, and keep their research moving. I envy them, but I cannot do so.

Tenure is becoming a problem. It is like a dark thundercloud on the horizon. You know it's going to rain like hell later - but you don't know where to run to escape the downpour. We are close to 80% tenured and those who are still untenured are "tenurable." I worry about us all growing old and inflexible together and about what this will do to the educational process.

It is my understanding that less than half of the candidates recommended for tenure in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences by individual departments will actually receive it.

# UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Unless you are better at such things than I was when I became a chairman, your position in the university is apt to be pretty vague. Some of the confusion can be eliminated if you understand at the outset some things about the makeup of your university that only gradually became obvious to me.

## The Structure of Universities

Although details will vary from university to university, you are apt to find that your position is definable in terms of three levels of administration.

The Upper or Central Administration. This unit consists of the President of the university and his staff, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Provosts and the like. Your dealings with these individuals are apt to be indirect and I would advise merely trying to develop and maintain a cordial, first-name, relationship to them but not to expect them to solve your problems. This is chiefly because most of your problems should be solved by the Dean of your college and your official dealings will occur at that level. The main impact of the upper administration on your life is apt to be through the increased busy work that these people create for you. In recent years, my correspondence has contained increasingly bitter commentaries upon the functioning of upper administrations. Such phrases as "fantastic increases in the amount of paper pushing," "tangles of administrative red tape," "unbelievable timidity and conservatism," and "a herd of Nervous Nellies" describe the general tone of these communications.

What to do about the general situation? Most of the people commenting on this problem seemed to think nothing but wait and hope for the best. Probably this is better advice than it sounds because of the nature of the

problem. It is possible to spend a great deal of time fighting the system without any important accomplishment and to end up feeling that you have slugged your way into the middle of a wet sponge. If you feel you must do something, there is probably no better suggestion than one you will think of yourself. Immediately after an interview with any administrator, write a brief note summarizing the agreements you believe were reached and invite a correction of the record if you are wrong in your understanding. Get a response in writing if you can. Remember, verbal commitments are not worth the paper they are written on.

Colleges and Schools. Almost everywhere your department is a part of a College of Arts and Science, Arts and Letters, Science and Mathematics, Life Science, Biological Science or Social Science. In addition, there will be an association with the Graduate School.

As regards associations of the first type, universities sometimes undergo reorganization and you may have to face the question of the part of the university to which your department will belong. Your decision will depend in part upon the nature of your individual department and for many purposes the decision may be less significant than you think. About the only point of general significance that I can think of is that Colleges of Science usually have better equipment budgets than the others and this may influence your choice. However that works out, the key administrators in your life will be the Dean of your undergraduate college and the Dean of the Graduate School. Maintaining good relationships to these individuals is essential.

In this connection a few pointers about how a Dean functions will be important. In most places the Dean will be able to approve recruiting programs and new appointments on individual authority. The Dean is probably

also the person who decides whether salary increments for your department are average, less than average or better than average each year. Reappointments, promotions and tenure are another matter, however. Sometimes these actions require the approval of an ad hoc committee set up to evaluate the individual. More often, the critical committee is a standing "Faculty Affairs Committee" or "Budget Committee." This committee reviews your recommendations on these matters and then makes its own recommendation to the upper administration which almost always concurs.

There is a small point to make about the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that may be of some use. Of all University administrators, the Dean tends to be the person in the middle these days because the College of Arts and Sciences is usually the largest division of the University. This Dean is required to absorb the bulk of the budget cuts imposed in the austerity programs that technically are university-wide. When the students rise in unrest, they are the Dean's students. If a department recommends tenure for a weak faculty member it is the Dean's responsibility to impose standards. These pressures tend to put the Dean in conflict. Sometimes the conflict will be with you, but, in my experience, more often with the upper administration. The Dean's interests and yours will tend to be compatible more often than not.

Department. Your main responsibility of course is to your own department. You provide the most important link between it and the college administration.

Departments will have their own administrative organization. By the time a department gets to the size of 30 members or so, diffusion of responsibility will begin to occur. For a department of that size you should have Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. If you can find the

right person to do the job, these can be the same person. A major function of such Directors is curriculum planning. There are real advantages to having the same person responsible for both graduate and undergraduate programs. If you find this solution feasible you may want to appoint this individual as an associate chairman who has other responsibilities and assumes your duties in your absence.

As departments grow they also tend to develop divisions along the lines of academic specialization. Such areas usually have an individual administrator and the areas may assume responsibility for curricular matters within the specialty, selecting graduate students, search for new faculty but definitely not the final decision on appointments.

The advantages of such an organization are: 1) it provides a means where groups with special interests can work out their problems; 2) it takes some of the load off your back. There is, however, a major disadvantage that will require your attention. This is a tendency for each training area to become a subdepartment with its own claims on space, equipment, faculty and programs of study. It will be very important for you to develop mechanisms that can bring such matters up for more general consideration as necessary. The Director(s) of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies will be key people in curricular decisions. Others may require the intervention of some departmental policy making group, typically an Executive Committee.

As your administrative apparatus grows there are two important points to keep in mind.

a) People who take on heavy responsibilities (Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, etc.) should receive some reduction in teaching load. b) Be sure to delegate authority to act but not to establish policy.

A fairly typical committee structure, of the type that exists in departments of moderate size, appears on the next page.

Our undergraduate enrollments are dipping noticeably. Our graduate enrollments are declining but the process is slower and less obtrusive. The faculty are finally beginning to understand how these processes are affecting us but their acceptance of it is grudging. They tend to want the administration to stem the tide but also resent being asked to take steps themselves to help recruit or retain undergraduates (who are the basis of everything budgetary here). They seem to repress notions of financial exigency and some continue to expect increased faculty growth.

Definition of a Committee
A collection of the unfit chosen from the unwilling by the incompetent to do the unnecessary.

I would advise anyone, regardless of rank or professional stature at the time the chairman's duties are offered, to make the decision that scholarly activities will have first priority, to stick with it, and to make clear to the faculty members of the department and to the administration that this will be the condition for accepting and retaining the administrative duties. The department may suffer more by this decision but the potential chairmen will suffer less.

My strongest advice to a new chairman is this: have an exceptionally competent secretary and earn her confidence by placing your full confidence in her. As she learns your policies and procedures, your style and method of operation, turn over more than just routine responsibilities to her. Let her make as many decisions as possible, including important ones such as affecting the budget. Stand behind her decisions even if they are not exactly the ones you would have made at the time. In short, make her role in the department even more important than yours as concerns the continuing operational matters. You can then devote your energies to matters that only you can do.

## Some Typical Departmental Committees

I. Committees that are usually advisory to the Chairman

A. Executive Committee - (Chairman plus elected members) - Deals with problems of general policy.

B. Student Advisory Committee - (Elected or appointed graduate and undergraduate students) - Deals with educational and other problems of students.

C. Personnel Committee - (Makeup varies greatly) - Makes recommendations in area of salary, promotion and tenure.

D. Space Committee - Controls allocation of space.

II. Committees that usually report to the entire faculty

A. Committee on Undergraduate Education

B. Committee on Graduate Education

These committees are usually chaired by a Director of Undergraduate Studies and a Director of Graduate Studies. Faculty members may be elected, appointed or hold membership by reason of another position (e.g., chairman of a training area). Students are often members.

These committees deal with problems of curriculum and often make recommendations in the area of faculty recruitment. For mutual problems they may meet jointly.

III. Training Committees

Each such committee consists of all members with primary interest in a training and/or research area (clinical, physiological, industrial, etc.). Each area is chaired by an appointed individual. It is responsible for the details of the graduate curriculum in the area and works with the graduate and undergraduate committees on the staffing of courses. It recruits graduate students, manages training grants, and supervises student progress.

IV. Committees to deal with recurrent problems such as faculty awards, honors, undergraduate prizes, the departmental reading room, colloquim, minority group students, space and relationships to non-academic staff.

These "committees" are often one-person committees depending upon the magnitude and complexity of the problem.

## DEFINING YOUR ROLE

There are a few departments in which the chief administrative job is essentially custodial and of a bookkeeping nature. In these institutions the position rotates year by year and members take turns in the position. The drawbacks in this arrangement are so obvious that it is rare. Clearly, it is difficult for a one-year administrator to accomplish anything rewarding. If the one-year position is a tradition or seems to make sense in your department, however, an arrangement recently worked out by one department sounds effective: "We have moved to a system of a Committee of Chairs consisting of a Chair-elect, Chair and Post-chair. Each spring the department elects a new Chair-elect to take office the following fall at which time the old Post-chair retires and the other two move up a peg. There is a certain amount of division of labor among the chairs; the Chair has a 9-unit reduction in teaching load (from the 12-unit standard); the other two have 3-unit reductions."

More typically the chairman serves a term of three to six years, which may theoretically be long enough for one to "build something" and to leave a mark on the department. The rate of turnover in the job (perhaps 30% per year) suggests, however, that it may be very difficult to do anything constructive in any amount of time. A basic problem seems to be that one gets so bogged down in the details of the job at the outset that there is never time to look at the department in perspective, to decide important directions of development or to consider the future from a semi-detached point of view. I suspect that this is the major source of frustration in this particular job.

Obviously, attempting to develop a long-term plan is important. It probably would be highly desirable for the Chairman elect to spend some time before actually assuming the new role in developing such a plan and

My role as chair has become that of facilitator and peace agent. That sort of political thrust holds very little interest for me. So this is my last year as chair - let someone else play ego massager!

About three years ago our department moved to a rotating chairmanship, anticipating that we would no longer be able to recruit from outside the department to fill this position. Our present plan is to elect from our own number senior faculty that are willing to serve for about three years as chairman, with very substantial inducements to ensure acceptance of election. The inducements include a one-semester sabbatical at the end of the three-year term, a $2,000 administrative stipend during the term of service, one of the top merit recommendations for permanent salary increases during the term of service, a research assistant, complete discretion over his teaching load (including no teaching responsibility at all), and a $1,000 grant each year for research assistance and supplies.

I doubt that there is any single model of a chairman because it depends so much on the circumstances. In fact having served as the chairman of two different departments I know that my own effectiveness was very much greater in one department than the other.

Bunk Carter's Law
At any given time there are more important people in the world than important jobs to contain them.

discussing it with members of the department. Some of the matters that most often seem to need thought and planning include the development of necessary additions to faculty and supporting staff, space utilization, equipment, the size of the graduate program and its structure, and the number of undergraduate majors. Sometimes this analysis will reveal the existence of programs that are no longer viable. In such cases obviously, it would be desirable either to strengthen such programs or to eliminate them completely. The latter course is always painful, but some of the most successful dealings with departmental problems reported in my surveys have involved exactly this.

There are also more subtle problems that are probably more important. Is the department to have some special orientation to which the more practical items above should contribute? How is the obvious conflict between the autonomous needs of special areas and the existence of the department as a coherent entity to be resolved? What stance will the department assume with respect to the relative importance of research, teaching and service in its faculty?

Leader, Manager or Passive Caretaker?

One major problem that deserves earlier consideration than it usually gets is the general nature of the departmental administrative role. Three such roles seem distinguishable: Those of leader, manager and passive caretaker. You will find yourself functioning in all of these roles. It is the balance that you strike among them that will determine your effectiveness and satisfaction with the job.

Passive Caretaker. The custodial form of administration is probably the easiest role to slip into, but, as we have seen, the satisfactions are too few to make it an attractive one. Moreover, exclusively playing this part

would work against the development of the department. All that such an administrator could accomplish would be the perpetuation of old programs. Insofar as possible that caretaker role should be passed on to nonacademic personnel. Here are some caretaking responsibilities that some of our colleagues have complained about, all of which in my opinion should have been turned over to a secretary: the paper work involved in keeping track of the progress of graduate students, responding to questionnaires designed to determine the status of minority group students, the details of scheduling courses, acknowledging and keeping track of negotiations with applicants for jobs (this one has, as we have seen, become a serious problem but it should not be your problem), the paper work involved in complying with affirmative action programs. Unless you find a way to get out from under the burden of such tasks, chairing a department will surely become a major source of dissatisfaction.

Such a development may be inevitable. In my own experience (in spite of all the advice to the contrary that I have just given) my history has been one in which I have found myself taking on more and more custodial chores. Partly it has been a matter of my recognizing more and more of them that need doing. Partly it has been a matter of knowing that I can often do them myself in less time than it would take to solicit the help of a colleague.

Manager. My image of the administrative manager is that of the person who spends his entire day working for the good of the department chiefly by serving as the link between his own faculty and the administration. Inevitably your role will take on a large element of this managerial function. But, again, playing only this role leaves you doing less than you should. Specifically you will devote too little time to looking ahead and planning for the department's future.

Leader. What all of this is leading up to is that the complete departmental administrator must take on the responsibilities of leadership. But now there comes a basic question: Leadership in what areas? What should you delegate? Where should you retain responsibility yourself? Stuart Cook, former chairman of the Psychology Department at the University of Colorado, speaking to the first Workshop for New Chairmen, answered the question this way: Whatever you delegate, you should retain for yourself five areas in which you plan to take positive leadership. They are:

1. Planning the directions in which your department will develop
2. Developing a strong faculty
3. Managing money
4. Managing space
5. Deciding the kind of administrative work you will do

Having decided to delegate responsibility for everything but a limited list of items at the level of policy, you will face a challenge that may be hard to meet, that of delegating, in addition to responsibility, the authority to make certain decisions. But you must do it. Faculties being what they are, failure to yield certain decision-making power, will leave you doing everything yourself.

Faculty or Administration?

In recent years a new dimension has been added to the issues relating to your role: Are you a member of the faculty or a member of the university administration? Most of us take the position that we belong to the faculty. We came from it and we expect to return to it. We belong there for reasons of training, commitment and established loyalties.

In a few places, emerging unionism has brought to light considerations that support this position. Unions, of course, deal with management on matters of contract. If you are designated as a member of the administration,

you will find yourself in the central position in monetary negotiations, a situation that poses problems with which you are probably poorly equipped to cope. This means that if unionization comes to your university you should try to be "worker" rather than administration. In addition to negotiating problems if you become "management" the distance between you and your faculty increases immensely. Those to whom this has happened describe their situation as acutely uncomfortable.

> I believe the role of our departmental chairmen has changed in the direction of departmental advocate to the university administration in the obtaining of resources necessary to improve the quality of departmental graduate programs.

My own role is disgusting. After five years, I am getting tired. My research has suffered a great deal, my mental health is weakening, and I'm ready to quit. Unfortunately, I agreed to help ramrod through the new college curriculum changes. So I will have to stick with that for another year or two. I also promised the new senior appointments that I would not quit and throw administrative concerns on their shoulders. So to provide a stable environment, I am asking another senior person to become associate head. And I am going to go fishing now and then.

The Buttered-side Down Law
Any object will fall so as to do the most damage.

Mrs. Murphy's Corollary
You cannot determine beforehand which side of the bread to butter.

Zymurgy's Law of Evolving System Dynamics
Once you open a can of worms, the only way to recan them is to use a larger can.

## STRENGTHENING THE DEPARTMENT

A grim reality that you may as well face at the outset is that in your efforts to build and strengthen a department you are not going to be able to rely much on changes in the behavior of existing faculty. The problems that drove your predecessor from the job will continue to exist. Old frictions will remain. The stars of the department will still be there, but so will accumulated deadwood, the non-contributors and the trouble makers. This means that much of what you accomplish will have to be through the recruiting of new personnel and encouraging their development.

Recruiting. The initial problem, of course, is to obtain permission to hire new faculty. Do not be surprised if you discover (in spite of informal commitments) that this is a major problem. The wisdom of hindsight has made it clear to many of us that the permission to recruit new faculty should have been made a formally stated condition of accepting the job in the first place. Later on, about the only basis on which recruiting can proceed is through granting of an occasional new budget line by the administrator who controls such things. Sometimes new positions can be obtained by the "mortaging" of positions that will become available later on through retirements to produce needed increments in faculty strength. Such planning in advance also protects the department against loss of the position later on should times, or merely the university administration, change for the worse.

A special problem involves a question of the level at which new appointments should be made. Departments in search of instant reputations find the idea of appointing at least a few distinguished people very attractive, but almost everyone who has gone this route has found it a route to frustration. Several problems stood in the way: the simple difficulty of finding distin-

guished people who could be interested in changing positions, the intellectual threat that having a very distinguished person poses for some existing faculty, the salary discrepancies and consequent potential frictions that are likely to result and the top-heavy quality that recruiting at advanced ranks can produce in a department. All of these factors make it possible to spend a great deal of time trying to recruit people at the "star" level without accomplishing anything. Sooner or later you will probably recognize that the only viable option is to recruit good people at relatively junior levels and to provide them with the opportunity to do good work. Fortunately, many academic fields are developing so rapidly that it is probably possible to develop a "star" in less time than it takes to hire one.

Setting the stage for recruiting. Academic departments have become very heterogeneous in recent years with the result that a single department will contain individuals with very different values and standards for the acceptability of a new colleague. This means that it is possible for people with one set of expectations to dominate the initial recruiting operation and for another set of people to vote the recruit down later on. This makes it important for you to develop mechanisms that lead to the discussion of such problems prior to setting recruiting procedures into motion. It will take time but the whole departmental faculty should be invited to read the curriculum vitae of prospective candidates. The whole faculty should also discuss candidates and job specifications. In this way it should be possible to invite only candidates with a good probability of being acceptable. Since you are probably the only person in the department with a fair grasp of the aspirations of subgroups, the problems faced by special areas and the like, you should be an ex officio member of every recruiting committee.

Make your search thorough. Recruiting procedures themselves are pretty standard. Through whatever contacts it has and through advertising, the department develops a roster of candidates. From the most promising of these, a list of a half-a-dozen possible recruits is assembled. Then as much information as can be obtained is collected on each of these candidates. A comparison of credentials then leads to a series of recruiting visits, and the job is offered to what appears to be the strongest candidate. Departments that have achieved notable success in their recruiting efforts have been very thorough in their search. The dossiers of candidates in these departments contain a curriculum vita, copies of the candidate's publications, three or more letters of recommendation and summaries of telephone conversations. Given the importance of recruiting to the strength of a department, going to such lengths appears to be very much in order.

Possibly the greatest peril of all in the recruiting process derives from attempts of present faculty members to secure appointments for their personal friends. Particularly if the present member is a productive and highly respected scholar, his or her recommendation can lead to an abbreviation of the information gathering procedure and a failure to consider competing candidates. Unfortunately, faculty with superb academic credentials sometimes have deplorable taste in people. It should probably be a formal departmental rule that an appointment should never be made without a full-scale search for the best possible person for the job.

Recruiting visits. A recruiting visit takes more than a day in many cases. It is important to plan a schedule, to distribute it to members of your faculty, and to give a copy to the recruit--allowing him to suggest changes. The following schedule is probably more extensive than necessary for most visits. Obviously you can cut it down as required.

Day 1

7:00 p.m. arrive. Dinner on plane. Pick up at airport. Faculty member A.

8:30 - 10:00 p.m. Dutch treat drinks at hotel bar. All interested faculty.

Day 2

8:30 a.m. Pick up at hotel. Faculty member B.

8:45-10:00 Tour of building. Faculty member C. Show recruit prospective office and lab space, as well as shop, computer, clinic or whatever is of special interest.

10:00-12:00 Meeting with faculty in recruit's training area. I believe that a group meeting is usually more satisfactory than individual discussions. Note, however, that individual discussions are arranged by the pick-up and delivery responsibilities of several faculty.

12:00-2:00 p.m. Lunch with faculty of recruit's training area.

2:15-2:45 Meeting with Dean X. Faculty member D (frequently will be you) accompanies and may or may not remain for interview. I do because: (a) it adds to my information about the candidate, (b) sometimes I can help make the process go more smoothly, and (c) occasionally I use the interview to make a few unrelated points with the Dean. Deans are busy people and arranging this appointment is what you should do first, working the other recruiting activities around it.

3:00-3:30 Free to prepare colloquium.

3:30-5:00 Colloquium.

5:00-6:00 Return to Hotel. Faculty member E.

6:00-8:30 Dinner (by invitation) Faculty member F.

8:00-- Social (by invitation) Faculty member G.

Day 3

8:30 a.m. Pick up at hotel. Faculty member H.

8:30-9:30 Tour of community. Cover possible living quarters, shopping areas, anything of interest. Faculty member J.

9:45-11:45 Meeting with all interested faculty outside recruit's special field. Again a group meeting.

12:00-2:00 Lunch with Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, Chairmen of recruit's training area and of the Department.

2:00-3:30 Meeting with interested students. (Get students' opinions as a part of the information entering into your eventual decision. It is often very revealing.)

3:30-4:30 Meeting with Chairman of department to discuss position details.

4:30 Leave for airport. Faculty member J.

By the time the recruit reaches you a good many of his or her questions will have been answered. It pays to check, however, and to be sure that the recruit goes away with the information on the next page.

The Mechanism of Appointment

Decisions on whether or not to appoint a prospective faculty member are the most important decisions a department makes. The following guidelines may be helpful.

1. Do background work thoroughly before inviting a person for a recruiting visit in order to keep the number of them to a minimum.

2. For purposes of comparison, it is probably useful to look at two or three people (seldom more) for a given job.

3. The decision to appoint should be made by your whole faculty, not just you or a select committee.

4. The vote to reappoint should be by open ballot. If faculty members have reservations, they should "speak now or forever hold their peace."

5. Ideally, the vote for appointment should be unanimous. A minority of 25 percent is probably enough to indicate a negative action.

6. Let the candidate know the results of your discussion as soon as possible.

Monetary

Salary and schedule of payment (9 or 12 months)
Opportunities for summer teaching
Fringe benefits
a) retirement plan
b) hospitalization and insurance
Moving expenses

Research Support

Laboratory and office space
Support for equipment
Availability of graduate student assistants
Intramural research support programs
Expectations in the area of extramural support
Secretarial, shop, computer and other support
Money for travel to conventions

Teaching Responsibilities

Courses
Opportunities to change courses, add new ones, etc.
Quality of students
Honors program or courses
Policy on graduate-undergraduate teaching

Personnel Policies

Conditions affecting promotion
Expectations in the area of tenure
Methods of faculty evaluation
Sabbatical policy and policy on other leaves of absence

Departmental Operation

Structure of the department
Faculty meetings
Expectations for participation in committee work

The Community (if recruit needs such information)

Public schools
University concert series and other amenities
If possible provide the recruit with
a) map of area
b) copy of daily newspaper
c) copy of University newspaper

Faculty Development

Probably the most neglected responsibility of departmental administrators is the guiding and encouragement of the faculty they work so hard to recruit. I know that I am among the guilty and, beyond that, I do not recall a single instance in the letters I have received where anyone has discussed the issue. With the tenure situation so difficult, it has become very important to get young faculty off to a good start. Otherwise they may find themselves in the same situation as that of one person to whom I talked recently: "I came here partly because this university had a reputation for letting new faculty do their own thing. That turned out to be true and it was really nice. But now that I'm coming up for tenure soon, I realize that someone should have told me what they expected of me." If this individual fails to be granted tenure that outcome will bring to light the saddest consequence of our failure to provide proper guidance for our young faculty.

As it turns out, I was "developed" by Walter S. Hunter on my first job at Brown University over 30 years ago. Since Hunter was unusually successful in his dealings with young faculty, let me first list the lessons I learned from him. There were only three which as I recall came in order, about a year apart.

Lesson 1. In life, young man, there are first things and most important things. In this university the first thing is your responsibility to the undergraduate students. Fulfilling that obligation earns for you the right to do the most important thing--research. Get your courses in shape and only then get into the laboratory.

Lesson 2. In research, ideas are more important than elegant equipment and fancy space. Clarence Graham did the work that made him a member of the National Academy in a converted coal bin.

Lesson 3. Give some thought to where you want to be five or ten years from now and turn your research in that direction. (Hunter's advice to me was to go into the field of child development--incredible foresight given that the date must have been 1947.)

Now some lessons of my own.

Lesson 4. In your research work keep an eye on application. The psychological world is turning in that direction.

Lesson 5. Do not let the bookmen seduce you. I know that there are plenty of models in the department to suggest that writing textbooks can be lucrative. If you give a moment's thought to who these models are, however, you will recognize that their reputations were established before their scholarly careers degenerated in that way.

Lesson 6. It is important that you publish. You must do so if you are to participate in the benefits of academic life. Not only your place in the university and the profession, but your self evaluation are at stake. Numbers of publications are less important than their quality. Stick to refereed journals; the others count against you.

Lesson 7. Take on administrative responsibility slowly. Five years from now I will be calling on you for important contributions of that type. So will the central administration of the university, and I hope that you will be willing to serve. But get your scholarly feet on the ground first.

Lesson 8. Be a good university and departmental citizen. Attend colloquia. A little exposure to work outside your own field will not hurt you. Get your textbook orders in on time. Do your grading conscientiously. Treat students with respect even when you must deny requests.

Faculty Evaluation

Whether you like it or not (you probably won't), you will be required to make evaluations of faculty in connection with salary recommendations, promotion, tenure and reappointment. These evaluations will create your most excruciatingly painful moments of truth. For that reason, you should give some very careful thought to the procedures used to arrive at such evaluations. They will be quite different for making salary recommendations than they are for recommendations for reappointment, promotion and tenure.

Salary recommendations. Modal practice in arriving at salary recommendations seems to be as follows: Prior to the time when you are required to submit your recommendations, each faculty member is asked to submit a report of activities for the preceding year. Usually these reports are the same as those required by the university administration. If these reports are less comprehensive than should be to be useful, you may want to develop your own form for securing the information. I have included a sample as an appendix to this report. At a minimum you should obtain, in this way, quantitative information on publication, service to the department, university and scholarly discipline, and teaching. Except for the last-mentioned item, these reports will also provide information on the quality of the faculty members' contributions.

The most difficult portion of the evaluative procedure involves the evaluation of teaching. Student evaluations are now required in most universities but they are of limited help. At best they represent a measure of "consumer satisfaction" but fall short of providing an index of true teaching effectiveness. Three supplementary procedures appear to have value: 1) direct discussions with students to provide special information, 2) retrospective evaluation by graduating senior majors may provide knowledgeable

reports ("When I took Professor X's course, I thought it was the greatest course I ever had but now I can't remember why.") 3) visits to classrooms by colleagues are becoming fairly common. If you adopt such a procedure, it is important to try to make these visits constructive and, at all costs, to avoid infringing on academic freedom. A brief description of one successful program follows.

"A committee of three visitors talk over the course plan with the instructor, then visit the class, and finally tell the instructor what comments they have. This is not an evaluation, I don't even see the report unless the instructor requests that it be forwarded to me. I can, however, request that a specific person be visited again, and see the second report. The reason for this is to make the system one which improves instruction (allowing the faculty member to profit from the advice received after the first visit) and not one that puts the faculty under the gun, again. It does have the side effect of giving us something besides the student ratings to use when evaluating faculty.

The visiting committee is chosen with care. In some cases the purpose is to instruct them, not to help the instructor. For example, we now have one of our worst instructors sitting in on the classes of one of the best instructors in the same field. The point should be obvious."

How salaries are established. Although there is considerable variation in the details, next year's salaries are set by a procedure that occurs in a series of steps: 1) The total university budget is established by a legislature, Board of Regents or whatever group has the power of the purse in your university. Usually this total budget comes with major allocations already made to building, capital equipment, personnel and the like. 2) The central university administration provides the several deans with fractions of the

In order to enforce the recognition of merit in departmental recommendations for salary increases--which some chairmen find difficult--I once proposed that our Dean set up the following system: He would ask each chairman to identify the individuals for whom that chairman had recommended merit increases, as opposed to standard or cost-of-living increases. The chairman would indicate in dollars the amount of this increase for merit.

For his part, the Dean would hold back a part of his budget to use for purposes of supplementing these same merit increases by a formula that would depend upon the extent to which there was university-wide use of merit increments. If the Dean held back $50,000 and the total of recommended merit increases was $100,000, the Dean would add 50¢ to every dollar of merit increase the chairman recommended--and for the very same individuals who received such increments from the chairman.

It's a nice idea--a case of making the punishment fit the crime: The chairman who refused to recognize merit would not be able to participate in the plan. The only problem would be that some chairmen would try to set up a "rotating merit system" by which different faculty members are meritorious in different years. But the Dean could stop those shenanigans.

The idea appealed to the Dean but it was blocked by his budget committee--on the ground that pay is so bad in some departments that the only fair thing is to treat everyone the same----oh well.

personnel budget to use for next years salaries. 3) Some mechanism exists by which the dean and the department come to a final decision on each faculty member's salary for the next year.

Although, again, there is great variation, modal practice in non-unionized universities for accomplishing this last step works like this: You receive from the dean a list of current faculty and their salaries, together with a total number of dollars that you will be allowed to use for salary increments. There may or may not be a stipulation that a certain fraction of the increment money must be used for merit increases.

In most departments the recommendations for salary increases are made by the chairman who has wide latitude in the procedures to be followed. Some make the hard decisions entirely on their own but most ask for input from others. Often individual faculty are asked to provide information. The chairman of the faculty member's training area may be consulted. Sometimes, a personnel committee make recommendations which may be binding on the chairman but are more apt to be advisory.

Obviously the money provided for salary increments will be some percentage of last year's salary budget. A fairly common way of proceeding is to calculate this percentage of each faculty member's salary and then increasing or decreasing this figure to reward merit and to punish the opposite. Just how substantial these adjustments are is doubtful. Over the past year or so I have seen several sets of data where salary has been plotted graphically against years of service. In every case the function would have been well fit by the linear function $Y = mX + b$ where Y is salary, X is years of service and b is initial salary.

Reappointment, promotion and tenure. The difficult situation in the universities described earlier has had its greatest impact on the granting of tenure. Procedures are now quite elaborate almost everywhere. They

include these steps :

1. The candidate is asked a) to bring his personnel folder up to date including any information that might strengthen his case, b) to nominate one or two people to serve as members of a committee to present his case and c) to nominate several people within the university and outside it to whom the committee might write for opinions.

2. The committee just mentioned is set up. Usually it consists of three people, a chairman from the individuals training area and two others, one of whom is one of the nominees also just mentioned.

3. The committee prepares an evaluation which may or may not include a recommendation. The evaluation is typically very detailed and includes reports in the following categories: a) a summary of the individuals contributions as reflected in his curriculum vita, b) copies of letters obtained from people in the individuals field, c) interviews with <u>every</u> member of the department and a selection of students.

4. The committee presents this report to the group responsible for making the decision on tenure-most often all other tenured faculty. There is a vote by secret ballot.

5. The chairman sends to the Dean a copy of the committee's report, together with a statement of the outcome of the vote and, in most universities, his own recommendation.

6. A standing committee chaired by the Dean reviews the case. If this committee agrees with the departmental recommendation, that recommendation goes on to an officer of the university for further consideration.

Disagreement with departmental recommendations by the dean's committee or with that committee's recommendation by the higher officer create problems. I believe that what should happen in either case is that

the lower-ranking group should be asked to reconsider. One advantage of such a procedure would be that, in this way, departments could get a better understanding of the changing criteria employed for making tenure decisions above the level of the department.

Dealing with Dismissals. One implication of the materials just presented is that you are going to have to face the unpleasant responsibility of dismissing a faculty member every now and then. How should you go about it? The most constructive recommendation I can offer is to start the process as early as possible. The straws in the wind are usually there early and it is possible to consult with junior faculty early and discuss their performance. These faculty will often hate you for it but at least you can spell out guidelines early. On this basis, I am slightly in favor of initial three-year appointments which will give the faculty member time to prove himself (one way or the other) and the department time to arrive at a decision based on evidence.

But, this will not make the situation pleasant. The following paragraph from another chairman makes the point and offers some additional advice.

"The downright viciousness which occurs when people are let go is upsetting, but not surprising. Jobs are hard enough to get for brand new Ph.D's; but for slightly used Ph.D.'s with warranty expired!!! Since the chairman deals with a person whose back is to the wall, things get pretty tight. So, if the chairman is upset by bitter personal attacks, said chairman had better resign. The person being dropped has to either admit inadequacy or find a sinister force--and one is sitting right there in the big office. Second piece of advice--"BE OPEN". In particular, be sure that you both are and give the appearance of being eager to listen to advice on personnel matters from all your colleagues and students. This means that you spend

# BUDGET

In terms of sheer frequency, budgetary problems will probably be more difficult than any others you will have to face. Most of us have not been trained in the basic skills required to plan and deal with a budget which may run to several million dollars in a large department. If you are lucky, the details of such matters can be turned over to someone else, but there will be occasions (typically, decision-making occasions) in which some understanding of the bookkeeping process will become essential. Unfortunately, you will also have to make decisions in a good many trivial situations. Money shortages have meant that small expenditures have to be monitored on a day-to-day basis. Since so many of the things faculty spend money for are one-time costs, it is likely that there will be no rules to give an administrative secretary that will cover all of them. You will be asked to approve such items with some frequency.

Another source of difficulty is that exactly what is included in a departmental budget is much less clear than the uninitiated is apt to suppose. The budget over which you are expected to keep some kind of account may or may not include faculty and staff salaries, equipment, research grant budgets, telephone bills, maintenance contracts for office equipment, costs of renovation and a dozen others. In your first few encounters with the budget office, you are almost certain to encounter a few surprises. Even when you have learned something about the items you are expected to pay for on departmental accounts, it takes some three or four years for anyone to develop a realistic appreciation of what an adequate budget is. About all that can be said for certain is that budgets for equipment and supplies are universally too small.

a hugh amount of time letting people tell you things you already know, but it is very important that everyone feel that they have been listened to. Finally, in your official reports be brief and to the point. If you have to tell someone they are out, do it in writing, state the expiration date of the contract, and DO NOT SAY ANYTHING ELSE. You might have to justify that letter in court. Example: A chairman at the U of X wrote a "denied tenure" letter. He typed a nice, gentle letter saying how much he appreciated the man's teaching talents, acknowledging his scholarship, etc. The chairman's intent was to soften the blow. The result--the chairman was hauled to court, on the grounds that since the letter indicated that the chairman felt the person in question was qualified for tenure, the chairman's recommendation not to give same must have been based on personal prejudice! Of course, the chairman will win this suit, but it takes time, it takes time."

Professional Rules for Decision Avoidance

1. When it is not necessary to make a decision, it is necessary not to make a decision.
2. If you can avoid a decision, do so without delay.
3. If you can get someone else to avoid a decision, don't avoid it yourself.
4. If you can't get one person to avoid the decision, appoint a committee.

This is not, however, very much of an argument to use in attempting to improve the situation.

Friendly Persuasion

Probably nowhere in your administrative life will relationships to upper administrators count for more than they do in the case of budgetary matters. In money matters you must deal with an administrator who is responsible for the budgets in several departments. This administrator has problems that are at least as difficult as yours.

In dealing with this administrator, several respondents emphasize that developing a relationship of mutual trust is important. As an aid to this, it seems generally accepted that the maintenance of accurate and current records is important to make his argument for adequate funds. You will need to know how much you have spent, what you have spent it for, and where the departmental budget is apt to go in the future. Only in this way can one show that the departmental budget is simply not being squandered. In this connection, the records supplied by the budget or finance office are less than completely helpful. For one thing, they tend not to be current. They lag behind the present moment in terms of actual expenditures, but at the same time they reflect encumbrances that may extend to the end of the fiscal year. For these reasons, getting an accurate picture of the budgetary situation as of a given date may be much more difficult than it ought to be. It is important, however, to have such information and to have it accurate. Only by the persistent use of such evidence can one gradually convince the administration that the departmental budget must cover items that are peculiar to a discipline as well

as routine office expenses.

In the continual battle for an adequate budget, four or five lines of argument seem to have some chance of being effective. One is that increasing undergraduate enrollments and, particularly, increasing numbers of majors can make a case for a larger budget. A second approach is through the use of comparative data. Surveys of comparative salaries are available from several sources including the AAUP Bulletin and the national associations of several disciplines. These data can often be used to support the argument for higher salaries. A third approach is to make use of off-campus consultants. Frequently, an administrator will accept the word of an outsider that certain forms of support are essential to a department when he would not accept the same argument from you. A final, extreme, form of persuasion that appears to be widely practiced takes the form of a threat to resign either the chair or membership in the university faculty--"Brinkmanship" as one of my respondents called it. The effectiveness of this form of negotiation is hard to assess. Obviously it is a game you have to play "for keeps" if you play at all. Otherwise, after just one bluff, you find yourself in the position of another respondent who wrote: "What do I do about my budget now that the administration has found out that I really won't quit?" Even if the threat to quit is effective, it may lead to a deterioration of relationships between you and your administrative superiors. Probably the long-run consequences are sufficiently likely to be negative to recommend the use of this procedure only when the situation is desperate--when you are convinced that the situation really is one that you cannot live with.

Budget Administration

The problems of handling departmental budgets have become so great in recent years that, as a result, some new ways of dealing with these problems are emerging. In general they boil down to a concept of individual accountability in this area. In an extreme case, such funds were simply divided equally among faculty who were expected to use them in ways that would stretch them through the fiscal year. In other cases faculty members were asked for an estimate of their needs and funds were allocated in terms of these requests. It is not clear yet how well these schemes have worked out. The obvious dangers are: (1) Many faculty members will not be able to produce a realistic projection of needs. (2) Complete allocation of funds eliminates the flexibility that will be needed to meet emergencies. (3) Some funds will be required to meet general departmental needs and these must be considered. (4) In a large department the system would be certain to be cumbersome and probably take more to administer than it would save.

A more realistic solution may be to allocate funds to subdivisions within departments (training areas) undergraduate education, graduate education, the clinic or counseling center, the honors program, etc.) making the administrators for these functions responsible for accounting. Some such procedure seems essential both for monitoring current expenditures and for future planning.

Another form of economizing that seems sure to be required will involve making a sharper distinction than has been necessary before between personal and departmental business. It does not seem unreasonable to require faculty

and graduate students to pay for supplies and services required for such items as personal correspondence, books written for personal profit, and the operation of extra-university business. Obviously the distinction cannot be completely rigid. A scholarly book may be a major contribution to departmental purposes and may deserve support as such, and probably almost any publicational activity contributes something of this sort. But where personal rather than university gains seem paramount, personal payment for costs seems appropriate.

A similar state of affairs exists with respect to activities carried out under research grants and contracts. It is important, of course, to make sure that grant applications are written to cover the costs of research. Actually this is not hard to accomplish. It is often much more difficult to assure the expenditure of funds in the ways outlined in the application. It is often simpler and sometimes cheaper to obtain supplies, xerox copies and small items of equipment through the department. If this practice makes sense in a particular context, there is almost certainly a way to transfer funds from a research account to a departmental account. Investigators with funds available should be required to make an appropriate contribution.

Finally, economies (perhaps of considerable magnitude) can be effected by a department-wide cooperative approach to certain problems. Items that sometimes must come from department budgets include moving furniture within a building, the cost of delivering a film from the department that distributes audio-visual aids, the operation of the university mail room, losses from the library, storage of unused equipment, apparatus repair,

classroom supplies such as xeroxed copies of readings (which incidentally may well be illegal), meals consumed on recruiting visits and laundering lab coats. Each of these items will suggest ways of saving money by having students and faculty bear small burdens.

To take just one illustrative example here, the telephone budget in any department is apt to be a major item. What you will not know unless you look into it is that different telephone configurations vary enormously in cost. In one department of about 50 people it was discovered that shifting from a system where every faculty member had his phone answered by a secretary to one where he answered it himself cut $3,000 from the budget--really a substantial saving for a relatively small inconvenience.

One final point about budgets is that there are expenses that can eat into your personal finances. As an extreme case, I have one good friend for whom entertaining visitors, wining his colleagues and the costs involved in departmental travel run to several hundred dollars a month. Fortunately, he can afford it. Most of us cannot. If at all possible there should be a special budget to cover such items. For most of us $1-2,000 a year should be adequate. Such an arrangement is better than having your salary increased by that amount because then your expenditures become totally tax-free instead of just deductions.

Budgeting Your Time

Recruiting, faculty evaluation and dealing with budgetary problems will take a great deal of your time. If that was all there was to the job, however, it would probably be manageable. What escapes any listing of definite tasks

is the amount of time you will inevitably devote to small responsibilities that defy classification. Anything that is at all out of the ordinary seems to be referred more or less automatically to you. This includes students with questions, problems and complaints, outsiders with questions about the department, salesmen looking for the appropriate faculty member to contact, deans who think they have not done their job if they raise petty questions with anyone else, stray Ph.D.s off the street looking for employment, irate parents who think that their educational dollar is being squandered, local police in search of a student on almost any pretext, etc., etc., etc.

Obviously, you will have to take steps to protect yourself against such incursions on your time if you are to keep your academic head above water. Two such steps seem possible. One is simply to make yourself unavailable at certain times, during which you devote yourself to scholarly activity. If you do this you will probably find that the backlog of work that accumulated while you were gone is less than you would have guessed. As I have said, many of your most time consuming chores will be little ones. If you let them pile up for a day and deal with them all at once, they can be done quickly, partly because you probably will not have to deal with the person presenting the problem. Some things will have been done by others in your absence and some things will have turned out not to be worth doing. The other step to take is to get as much help as possible. Two kinds of help are available. One is the delegation of responsibility to colleagues; this in all large departments leads to the development of a committee structure. The other is a heavy reliance on non-academic personnel.

Be generous in the amount of time devoted to teaching and advising. Get into "the trenches" and teach introductory courses and advise freshmen students. Your faculty will admire you, the students won't believe it and you will undoubtedly enjoy it.

What I had to learn most was that in order to get things done without creating ill-will there must be discussions with the people who are involved or who perceive themselves as involved, have a stake in an issue, or feel that status is threatened. The latter is particularly important when it comes to dealing with the senior faculty.

Don't hide in your office. Talk to the faculty, about "nothing" and about how you can help each other. If you find that you've spent the past three days in your office and/or talking with administrators, spend at least half the next sitting in the coffee room "doing nothing."

Talk to each faculty member personally on a regular basis, preferably in a somewhat informal context such as a private lunch away from campus. Make it easy to learn about their problems insofar as they might affect the functioning of the department. In contrast, attempt not to take criticism to personally; make it constructive. Be willing to compromise on everything except standards of excellence.

Do as much of the "crud work" as you possibly can yourself. Don't get in the habit of palming off requests for various reports onto faculty members. You won't save yourself that much time and you'll produce unhappy faculty. Concentrate on simplifying the lives of the faculty, maximizing the time they have to teach and do research. Keep the faculty and secretaries happy. Get your best grant-getter to take on the task of acquiring outside funds and arrange things such that the task can be done. Serve primarily as encourager/facilitator of grant-getting.

In any large department these days at least one non-academic administrative assistant seems to be essential. The responsibilities of such personnel typically cover office management in all of its aspects, the hiring and firing of secretaries, recommendations for promotions and salary increases for secretaries and clerks, bookkeeping and accounting, equipment monitoring, grants management, and so on. In very large departments these tasks are sometimes the responsibility of an associate administrator who supervises one or more administrative assistants.

Major administrative responsibilities are quite time-consuming. For this reason it is common practice to reimburse major sub-administrators for their time by releasing them from some of their teaching responsibilities. A reduction of one course per year is quite typical. For you the teaching load should be one course a semester or one course a year.

There is good reason to rotate all administrative positions in a department. Obviously, this distributes the work. In addition, it probably improves department morale. For some reason many academics seem to fancy themselves as administrators and it is important to let even relatively junior faculty members try their hands at administration. Beyond this, there is probably nothing like having had such a responsibility to create sympathy with the problems of the person who inherits the job. For this reason, in many departments the practice is to distribute administrative responsibility widely. A typical department member may be on two or three committees, his tenure on each extending from one to three years.

A few respondents have written to tell me that they have given faculty

vicarious administrative experience by making copies of previous editions of this document available. At least it offers the faculty a glimpse at your problems. To some of them it will be quite revealing and, even if it does not provide practice in dealing with these problems, it may create sympathy for them.

Whatever Gets You Through the Summer. One thought that will occur to you is that much of what you cannot do during the academic year in the way of scholarly work can be done during the summer. Unless you make special plans, this thought will turn out to be a delusion. Many demands will continue to be made on you during that time. The most pressing will be student advising (particularly of transfer students) budgetary planning, the preparation of an annual report, securing space and facilities for new faculty and replacing non-academic staff who have a way of finding new positions then. As a result, it is not difficult at all to find yourself at least as busy during the summer as at any time during the year. Because of this:

1. You should demand a half-time summer salary for yourself to pay for what you cannot avoid doing.

2. If you can get away with it, you should get another half-time salary for a summer associate who can take over some of your chores.

3. Faculty with summer appointments should understand that their responsibilities include student advising and probably other tasks that will be peculiar to your situation.

4. Make sure that secretarial vacations do not leave you doing clerical jobs.

# PERSONAL STYLE

By nearly universal agreement, what will make or break you as an administrator will be your manner of handling day to day relationships to personnel. By equally universal agreement, the task is not an easy one. When you took the job you inherited a set of interpersonal relationships that nearly always includes elements of friction. There are ancient feuds, the frustrated aspirations of unsuccessful candidates for the position, residual loyalties to your predecessor, and some individuals with no loyalties at all. As a result of all this, the first shock that you are apt to experience is the discovery that you are an isolated person. There are conversations from which you will be excluded and parties to which you are not invited. Obviously, you and your administration are the main object of interest on these occasions. Your continuing task will be building and maintaining a position of trust.

Perhaps just because we are discussing an aspect of academic life, the key to the problem is communication. Academics more than anyone else have a desperate need for information, a need that is often coupled with overtones of paranoia. To many faculty members, the most available response in the hierarchy appears to be: "The chairman did so and so to me without consulting me or asking my advice." You must be prepared for this reaction in contexts that seem to be completely trivial.

The solution to this problem is simple for some people and perhaps impossible for others. If you are one of those for whom it is impossible, it might be better to give up the job now. The essential answer is openness. Although the answer is simple, it entails a great deal. First, it involves

a willingness on your part to take the time required to deal with every faculty member on an individual basis. At least some of us have developed a policy of seeing every faculty member every month or so for individual consultation. Before you rush into this cozy solution, however, note that with a 40-person faculty it might cost you a week's time every month.

A second aspect of openness is the quality of being able to spend a lot of time listening. If you do, you will frequently find sensible consensus which may not exactly match your offhand judgment with respect to some course of action. In that event, you will avoid an important commitment in some area of too little importance to warrant it. Just listening is not enough, however. If you can bring yourself to it, you should let people in on as many of the plans you may be entertaining as is possible. If you do this early, before you have committed yourself to a particular course of action, you will get all sorts of feedback and eventually a good grasp on what is possible with respect to a given departmental problem. This puts you in a position of being able finally to recommend a course of action that will almost certainly be accepted. All of this may sound a little wishy-washy, but two points: (1) Obviously, no leader (except perhaps in the military) can lead his group in directions opposed to their desires as a routine thing. (2) There will be times when a problem will be important enough to buck majority opinion, but such opposition is not attractive as a way of life, and common sense dictates its avoidance except in situations that really count.

In my opinion the discussion above comes as close as one sensibly can to answering a very frequent question about democracy in the management of

a department. If you consult widely before you act, you will have accomplished the aims of democracy in that members of the department will have had a voice in decisions that affect them. At the same time, however, you will avoid the situation that has arisen in some departments where every trivial thing gets decided "democratically" at faculty meetings.

Conclusion: A Toast to the Initiate

As the foregoing materials show, my surveys reveal more about the problems you have to face than they do about solutions. On the other hand, not one of my respondents has ever suggested that the job was not worth doing. It is a big job and an important one but it takes a toll in terms of scholarly productivity and physical and emotional weariness. Somehow you will have to find the resources to deal with these problems or else within a year or two you will be among the thirty percent or so of us who are giving up the job. So for you I have modified the old toast: As you slide down the bannister of administrative life, you will find that most of the splinters are pointed in the wrong direction. May it be granted that you can steal, beg or borrow a pair of iron pants. If not, remember in the words of one resignee, "They also serve who only cut and run."

> I learned things from being chairman, about myself, and even more about my colleagues. Some of the latter learning was dispiriting, as when I really got into their teaching, research, and scholarly activity at promotion time and saw that some were downright fakers. On the other hand, I also learned that some of my colleagues were doing brilliant though little recognized work, and that most of them would do what had to be done for the Department when the chips were down.

Grandma's Axiom
A chicken doesn't stop scratching
just because worms are scarce.

Unlike previous chairmen of this department, I find the job to be delightful, manageable, and richly rewarding. In addition to the attention, deference, and various powers the chair has, there is a reduced teaching load and small extra pay. The one disadvantage (which I did anticipate) is the unavoidable need to be available for students, colleagues, and administrators. Also, there is an unending line of memors, letters, and phone calls. Still it is definitely a nice job.

I thoroughly enjoyed chairing the department. I still believe it is the administrative role where one can have a direct influence on students, faculty, curriculum, and even the college and university. The departmental chairperson is a key administrator in the university.

Finally, I really love this work and apparently stand a good chance of being re-elected for a second 4-year hitch during the coming year. My predecessor trained me well, I believe, and trusted me with his cherished child, a warm and energetic department. This work is the most exciting and challenging thing I have ever done.

# APPENDIX

The following form is a modification of one used university-wide at Colorado. It collects enough detailed information to make comparative judgments of faculty contributions.

One important value of having periodic reports of accomplishments is that they form an objective basis for counselling faculty. In a couple of cases I have decreased a faculty member's teaching load for a semester when the report suggested and discussion supported the conclusion that this would help the individual wrap an important project up. On another occasion I used the report to show a young faculty member that her research had gone into a blind alley. She turned to another topic and is making a good reputation.

Department of Psychology - Duke University

Report of Scholarly and Professional Activities

Name _____

Date _____

This report should cover your completed activities from the beginning of the last academic year to the beginning of this one. Activities in progress may be reported to date.

I. Publication: Use only the categories below that apply to your situation, identifying each category, A, B, C, . . . . Use additional sheets if necessary.

A. Books and monographs published. Give complete reference. Do not include items not yet published. You will list them later, in Item II.

B. Journal articles. Give complete reference. Do not include items that have not yet been published.

C. Technical reports. Include committee reports, final reports on research grants, etc.

D. Book reviews. Give complete reference. Do not include items that have not yet been published.

E. Other. Cite published material not included above.

II. Research, writing and scholarly work in progress.

A. Grants and contracts. Give title and identify funding agency, grant period and your role.

B. Grants and contracts applied for. Indicate status: approved, denied, etc.

C. Unpublished books and articles. Give status of the manuscript: in preparation, submitted for publication (indicate journal), in press (indicate journal).

D. Other.

III. External scholarly activities. (List below on next page).

A. Offices in professional organizations.

B. Consultation with public agencies and groups. (e. g. Study section memberships).

C. Editorial responsibilities.

D. Conferences attended. Indicate the nature of your participation.

E. Memberships on boards and committees of professional organizations.

F. Other.

IV. University service. Membership on departmental, college and university boards and committees. Include administrative assignments within the department.

V. Honors, awards, recognition.

VI. Teaching.

A. Formal courses taught. Give course number, title, semester and approximate enrollment. Include courses taught at other universities.

B. Students for whom you are major advisor. Indicate whether graduate or undergraduate.

C. Students for whom you are a member of thesis committee.